

REMARKS

It is noted that in Applicants amendment dated Jan. 9, 2003 claim 14 has been amended to define that "for each laser a shutter is supported in said receiver".

The undersigned intended this to mean that each laser was provided with its own individual shutter. This understanding of the undersigned should have been quite clear from the arguments of the undersigned in which it was said on page 3, lines 20-21 with regard to the prior art that in US 5,980,975 "no individual shutters are provided for each substrate to be coated" (in contrast to the arrangement according to the invention). And on page 4, first par. of the response, it was said that "the present invention provides for an apparatus in which each laser is monitored during the coating process and for each laser, a shutter is provided so that the coating process can be discontinued individually for each laser as the coating reaches the optimum thickness as determined by the individual laser monitoring".

It was only after a repeated discussion of the matter with the Examiner that the undersigned, entrenched in his understanding of the definition of claim 14, clearly saw the Examiner's view that the wording could also include an arrangement, in which a single shutter with an opening was provided for all the lasers, which would be moved from laser to laser for appropriate exposure of the lasers in succession.

The Examiner has indicated that an amendment defining an arrangement in which an individual shutter was provided for each laser would distinguish the claimed apparatus from the cited prior art and therefore render the invention patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 1 has now been amended to define that an individual shutter is provided for each laser, so that claim 14 should now be patentable.

Also claim 20 has been amended to overcome the objection of missing antecedent basis for the "shutter support structure".

Claims 15 to 20 are directed to particular features which are considered to be advantageous in connection with the coating apparatus of claim 14. They ought to be considered to be patentable together with claim 14.

Reconsideration of these claims and allowance of claims 14 to 20 is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

K. Bach

Klaus J. Bach, Reg. No. 26832